

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Bact 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/601,272		06/20/2003	Yasushi Enokido	MIT 10282 US 6440		
21403	7590	05/24/2005		EXAMINER		
STEVEN J		BURG		MAI, NGOCLAN THI		
238 MAIN S SUITE 303	STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CAMBRIDO	GE, MA	02142		1742		
				DATE MAILED: 05/24/2009	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			$W_{i}$				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	<u> </u>				
	10/601,272	ENOKIDO, YASUSHI					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Ngoclan T. Mai	1742					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a r y within the statutory minimum of thin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON t, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communicatior ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	1.				
Status							
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							
· <u> </u>	,—						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowal	•	• •	,				
closed in accordance with the practice under E	=x раπе Quayie, 1935 С.D	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims							
<ul> <li>4)  Claim(s) 2-19 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray</li> <li>5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>6)  Claim(s) 2-19 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.</li> <li>8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o</li> </ul>	wn from consideration.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in A rity documents have been u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage					
Attachment(s)		•					
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview S	ummary (PTO-413)					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s	)/Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152)					

M

Application/Control Number: 10/601,272

Art Unit: 1742

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. Claims 2-6, 8-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Novich et al.

Novich et al disclose a highly loaded, pourable suspension of particulate material for forming sintered material article having volume fraction of at least 55% by volume comprising submicron and/or narrow size range metal particles having particle size of less than 1 micron, col. 5, line 65 to col. 6,line 53. The metal powder used can be spherical, col. 3, lines 35-36. The slurries taught having high solid load, i.e. at least 55% by volume reads on the claimed at sediment density of least 50%.

Regarding claims 2 and 5, Novich et al teach utilizing solvent such as water and alcohol and dispersant less than 10 wt% (see all of the example) to disperse the metal powder, see col. 6, line 37- col. 7, line 41.

Novich et al teach using metal powder including silver, col. 6, lines 6-9. Since silver taught by Novich et al has the same shape and size as the metal powder taught by the applicant, (applicant paragraph [0040]), it would inherently has the claimed tap density.

Regarding claim 3, the silver-containing powder taught by Hampden-Smith et al. inherently has the claimed tap density because the powder taught by Hampden-Smith the same composition as the applicant, i.e., silver, (applicant paragraph [0040]).

"Where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or

Art Unit: 1742

substantially identical processes, a prima facie case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established, <u>In re Best</u>, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). When the PTO shows a sound basis for believing that the products of the applicant and the prior art are the same, the applicant has the burden of showing that they are not.' <u>In re Spada</u>, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Therefore, the prima facie case can be rebutted by evidence showing that the prior art products do not necessarily possess the characteristics of the claimed product. <u>In re Best</u>, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA I 977)."

Regarding claims 11, Novich et al teach the claimed limitation in col. 5, lines 35+.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Novich in view of Kodas et al.

The difference between the claim and Novich et al is that Novich et al do not teach mixing by the slurry by ultrasonic vibration.

Kodas et al teach that it is known to those in the art that micrometer-sized particles often form soft agglomerates as a result of their relatively high surface energy (compared to larger particles) and it is also known to those skilled in the art that soft agglomerates may be dispersed easily by treatments such as exposure to ultrasound in a liquid medium, col. 33, lines 19-38.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to mix the slurry containing micron-sized silver-containing particles in organic solvent taught by Novich et al. by ultrasonic vibration as this taught to improve the dispersability of the particles by Kodas.

Application/Control Number: 10/601,272 Page 4

Art Unit: 1742

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ngoclan T. Mai whose telephone number is (571) 272-1246. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00 PM Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (571) 272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ngoclan T. Mai Primary Examiner Art Unit 1742

\*\*\*